

October 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25043

vate Calendar No. 328 for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10878) for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10878

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Senior Master Sergeant Anderson G. Matsler, United States Air Force, retired, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$810.74 representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay he received during the period May 21, 1946, through December 31, 1962, due to an administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Senior Master Sergeant Anderson G. Matsler, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON H.R. 10327

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 10327 previously passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

A RUSH TO GET HOME

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the past 10 days have been somewhat revealing to me concerning how facts can be distorted and twisted. I could not help but be reminded of a Biblical expression, if I may be permitted to paraphrase it; that there are none so blind as those who refuse to see, there are none so deaf as those who refuse to hear or to listen.

Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that the action of the House on last week was not as bad as has been pictured, whether it was perfect or not. It is still the District's best hope for self-government.

Yesterday I had the pleasure of reading what I consider to be one of the best editorials that I have seen in the country regarding the action of last week. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall make that a part of my remarks today.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 4, 1965]

A RUSH TO GET HOME

It's easy to sympathize with the residents of Washington, D.C., in their effort to win the right to govern themselves. Congress, mostly in the person of the House District of Columbia Committee, has done a shoddy, indifferent job. Even so, the administration has acted in remarkable political haste lately to force through a home-rule measure.

Last week the House balked at a Senate-approved administration bill providing a readymade home-rule charter, and substituted a measure calling for the residents to draft a charter of their own. Now the two versions must go to a House-Senate conference. Though this raises the possibility no bill at all will pass this year, as has happened before, we think the House acted wisely in the face of heavy pressure.

Washington, it should be remembered, is more than just another big city with big-city problems. Since it is also the seat of the Federal Government, a certain amount of logic can be marshaled for Federal administration, however poorly it may have worked out in practice. In any event, writers of the administration plan appear to have been motivated more by the hope of quick congressional approval than by determination to provide an enduring, sound government for this special city.

To take one example, the city council envisioned by the administration charter would have an unwieldy 19 members. Why? Not because anyone thinks 19 is an effective number, but because Washington has more Negroes than whites and far more Democrats than Republicans. Thus 14 councilmen would be elected from neighborhood districts—assuring the few predominantly white areas of representation. And the five others would be chosen at large, with no more than three belonging to the same political party—assuring Republicans of at least two seats.

Our feeling is that the effect of the Negro-white ratio is irrelevant and best left out of the charter, and that two unwelcome Republicans couldn't hope to accomplish much among 17 hostile Democrats anyway. More importantly, any document drafted to fit a specific ethnic and political pattern is certain to grow outdated when that pattern shifts. As our Mr. Large recently noted on this page, even strong home-rule supporters have doubts about the administration-drawn charter.

The House substitute, on the other hand, provides first for a referendum to determine whether the people of Washington really want home rule. If so, a 15-man board of elected residents would hire its own consultants and write its own charter, which would then be submitted to another referendum. If the charter were approved, and if neither Chamber of Congress vetoed it, the plan would take effect 30 days later.

There is no guarantee, of course, that the residents' plan would be better than the one concocted by the administration, or, for that matter, than the current system. But the House approach is at least more cautious than the administration's and therefore stands a better chance of succeeding.

In any case, what our Capital City emphatically does not need is to be used in a fast power play aimed at short-term political gain for someone else. A chief virtue of the House substitute is that the new charter would be an instrument of the residents themselves—and that, after all, is what home rule is all about.

RECENT POLICIES OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

(Mr. COLLIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, recent policies of the U.S. Office of Education have reached the point where they demand the scrutiny and remedial action of this Congress. The recent withholding of funds from the Chicago schools climaxes a series of policy positions which the elected representatives of the people of this country can no longer afford to sweep under the carpet nor accept the rationale of those who run this office.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act specifically states that withholding of financial assistance under any program or activity to a recipient without an expressed finding on the record after an opportunity for hearing and then a failure to comply with such a requirement. It further provides that any act terminating or refusing to grant or continue assistance not be taken until the head of the Federal department or agency shall file with the committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program or activity a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. This provision also stipulates that no such action shall become effective until 30 days have elapsed after the filing of such report.

In checking with both the minority and majority staff counsels on the Committee on Education and Labor, I have been advised that the procedure prescribed by Public Law 88-352 has not been obeyed.

Education and educational policies established in this Nation are everybody's business. When the U.S. Office of Education embarks upon the type of plan it has in the self-styled personality tests for schoolchildren, voluntary or involuntary, it is high time that every Member of Congress and every citizen of this country be fully informed as to just what is going on.

The Office of Education has no right to secrecy regarding any of its policies or long-range plans to bring the traditionally free educational system in this country under the heavy hand of Federal planners.

A prime example of the cloak of secrecy was the proposal by Homer D. Babidge, who wrote a document, entitled "A Federal Educational Agency for the Future," which was promptly stashed away when Members of Congress began to ask questions. It was subsequently announced that it was inadvertently issued as a public document and was not meant to be so. If the proposals it embraces are in fact part of the formulation of long-range policy in the U.S. Office of Education, then I say it should have been a public document. It raises the question as to why it was whisked into oblivion at the point of congressional concern.

For years proponents of Federal aid to education charged that opponents who expressed fear of Federal controls were creating a strawman or a bogeyman. Well, those who persist in this attitude in

25044

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 5, 1965

the light of the recent exposé of the obnoxious personality tests and leaks of the long-range plans which are being made under the guise of a national assessment of the educational system in this country, must think that everyone else is intellectually blind or just plain naive, and whether you are a proponent or opponent of Federal aid to education is not the basic issue.

It is interesting to note that school officials in Los Angeles, Houston, Syracuse, Buffalo, Long Beach, Columbus, Boston, Cincinnati, and Cleveland have refused to participate in the personality test programs devised by the Office of Education. Chicago and Indianapolis are reported to be reluctant, although they have not expressed any final decision one way or the other.

I urge in this regard that every Member of Congress read page 23133 of the September 15 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains a reprint of the editorial, entitled "The Federal Textbooks," by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. If you are not fearful of Federal control over education, this editorial will not upset you—but if you are, as you should be, it should jar your eyeteeth.

Substantiating the self-styled personality tests, spokesmen for the U.S. Office of Education deal in semantics with regard to the language and intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in the legislation which seeks a Federal utopia in what has traditionally been the free educational system in this country. Congress has a responsibility to spell out its intent in the use of funds provided for education in keeping with what I am sure is the feeling and sentiment of most of the American people, and particularly the parents of school children in this generation as well as the generations yet to come.

The school boards and school administrators in this country who believe in the American system that has provided the highest standards of education for the greatest number of people of any nation in the world, had better give a close, hard look at these trends of Federal intervention into the school systems of this country.

And we had better understand what we are doing when we become a party to having foundations which are not subject to the decision of the public establishing by indirection public policy decisions.

Throughout this country we have competent, dedicated people in various communities serving on boards of education as well as in the State agencies. These are not people who are void of the importance of education, and they are in fact people, in the vast majority of the cases, who understand and are deeply interested in discharging the responsibilities which are theirs. We are today turning out teachers in far greater numbers than ever before, teachers who are better qualified in their profession than ever before in our history. Child psychology courses are among the more demanding requisites for a degree in education, and particularly for teachers in elementary schools. With this type of personnel, it would be a grave mistake

to permit bureaucrats in the field of education to numb the individual incentive and abilities of these people through any planned federalization of social attitudes and standards.

While I commend the Government Operations Subcommittee under the chairmanship of NEIL GALLAGHER for investigating the testing program of the Office of Education, I am firmly of the opinion that the Subcommittees on General Education and Special Education should also conduct hearings in order to go into all aspects of this program so that the Congress will be in a position to hold a tighter rein on the activities of this agency and place clearly upon the record its long-range plans and aims in the public interest.

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW IN SHADOWY JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public's right to know has never been as pertinent as in the case of the shadowy Johnson administration policy in the Dominican Republic.

Basically as a result of world turmoil, the Johnson administration has been fortunate that the Pope's visit to New York, the revolt in Indonesia, continued complications in Vietnam, and the Pakistan-India border war have driven the Dominican Republic fiasco out of the headlines, and it is thus being conveniently forgotten by the public.

As I analyze the matter, the following sequence of events took place in the Dominican Republic:

Our announced purpose for going into Santo Domingo was to see that a Communist regime like Castro's did not take over.

The first thing the United States did was to throw out the chief anti-Communist, Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who up to that time had the Communist rebels on the run. Gen. Wessin y Wessin was replaced by General Imbert, another staunch anti-Communist.

We immediately started feeding both sides without discrimination. Next, we applied what pressure we could to throw out General Imbert.

We never found fault with Colonel Caamano, the head of the Communist rebels; we only defended him.

We have now announced that a coalition government has been formed to which, of course, the rebels readily agreed. If there is anything a Communist loves, it is a so-called coalition government in which they are awarded the internal posts of security, foreign affairs, the army and navy, and so forth. By now, after long experience, our State Department knows the inevitable next step is a complete takeover by the Communists.

Former President Juan Bosch, whose campaign in 1961 received the financial support of the administration, has now returned after 2 years as our guest in Puerto Rico and set himself up in direct

opposition to the provisional government of President Hector Garcia-Godoy. Thus Bosch, a collaborator and example of the enlightened Kennedy-Johnson foreign policy in Latin America, has come home to haunt us and work with the Communists in the Dominican Republic.

From the briefings I have received as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I can only say that either our Department of State officials are, first, ignorant of conditions on the island; second, lying to Members of Congress, or third, withholding information from Congress; or perhaps a combination of the three. If this lack of cooperation and refusal to provide legitimate information is practiced in dealing with Members of Congress who have a legal responsibility in this area, obviously the public is being kept completely in the dark.

THE ADMINISTRATION-SPONSORED MINIMUM WAGE "BETSY" BILL

(Mr. GLENN ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to warn the unskilled, the disabled, the unemployed and the aged to batten down the hatches. The administration-sponsored minimum wage "Betsy" bill is heading for the floor of the House of Representatives. The surgeons of social justice are about to remove too much from the patient, the patient being the small businessmen in America. They are going to die along with the millions of jobs that are provided by their little businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed some very worthwhile measures; education bills, poverty bills and so forth. The forces of Government are about to offset all of these gains with a "job destroyer" called minimum wages.

Mr. Speaker, while we have been engaged in helping the very poor to reach the plateau of employment, we are about to raise this plateau beyond their reach. Inflation, the greatest thief of all, is about to be produced on this floor. Instead of eliminating great human needs, we are about to create these needs.

The strong, namely big business and big labor, are about to sit down to a fine meal if this bill is passed. The poor and the aged are going to be thrown a bone, a bone loaded with arsenic—the arsenic of unemployment and inflation.

WITHHOLDING OF FEDERAL EDUCATION FUNDS TO THE CITY OF CHICAGO

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing dismay at the withholding of Federal funds for the education of children in the city of Chicago. I feel that this withholding of funds points up the real danger of Federal aid to educa-